



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to clearness seems unduly disparaged. Without radical metaphor—in the Müller sense—language would be impossible; and without the poetic metaphor of common life intelligibility would be out of the question. It may fairly be doubted whether “Metaphor in distinction from simile, is a figure of force, not directly of clearness.”

Professor Hart has constantly tried to make his book “*interesting and stimulating*.” His choice of literary illustrations has done much to secure the desired end. A purely literary treatment would have added an element of interest not now present. The author’s own style is terse and perfectly clear. If it rarely charms by grace or inevitable felicity it is never tedious, and it sets no models of eccentricity. Probably with deliberation Professor Hart uses the cleft infinitive (pp. 29, 251, 315, *et al.*). In this he goes beyond Dr. Hall himself, who preaches cleft infinitive but to the discomfiture of logic and the comfort of most readers does not practice it. Deliberate, too, is probably the use of *the above* as an adjective (p. 29 *et al.*), a concession to commercial English. It is not clear whether the author would defend his use of *quite long* (p. 37); of *replaced* in “replaced them with foreign words” (p. 27); of *actions* in “reveal his character in his *actions*” (p. 69); of *evidenced* (p. 99). There are a few trifling slips in coherence: (p. 116), “Were the present condition and the previous condition identical (which they never are)”; (p. 347) “There is a city of Trenton in N. Y. and N. J.” On page 47, fourth line, the sense requires an *of* before *Gibbon’s*. On page 97 we have the victim of Webster’s eloquence called Goodridge, while he reappears on page 108 as Goodrich. Having jotted down these running comments, some of them perhaps hypercritical, let me confess having done scant justice to the practical side of the work. But then, the bookseller *soll nicht vorgegriffen werden*. Every teacher ought to own the book.

E. H. LEWIS

History of the United States, for Schools. By JOHN FISKE. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1894.

THE author and publisher intended this work to present some advantages over other works of its class. In some respects they have succeeded. The work is larger than the average school text—about 500 pages—and is very abundantly supplied with maps, portraits, and views of historic objects, over 200 in all. After each chapter is found a list of “Topics and Questions” which are intended to serve as an

analysis of the subject-matter of the chapter. These are much superior to those, usually found at the bottom of each page, in some of the older books, which put a premium upon memorizing the text by framing the question in the language of the text, or by directing the pupil to "tell what the author has to say on the storming of Stony Point." In most cases the form of the sub-topic is no key to its answer. It is noticeable that these outlines of chapters have fewer questions in them as the work advances. This certainly reduces their value. Besides, it must be admitted that such outlines ready-made take from the pupil the value that comes from making his own outline. What valid reason can be given against leaving some of this work for the pupil to do, after examples have been furnished him? Following the topical outline are "Suggestive Questions and Directions." These questions are intended to be answered partly from the text and partly from other sources, and thus the pupil is carried beyond the narrow limits of one work. The questions here are embarrassing from their very abundance. The danger is that the pupil may have his thoughts scattered among a very large number of minute and unimportant details. This could be remedied partly if there were a few synthetic questions to lead the pupil to fuse the answers into one great answer; but the differentiating and analytic question predominates and the integrating and synthetic question is almost entirely absent. Either under this head or that of "Topics and Questions" there ought to be questions and directions setting problems before the pupil which he is to solve. Such directions might be like the following: "Find the meaning common to the leading events between 1761 and 1775," or "Compare and contrast the conduct of the colonists during the Stamp Act riots with their conduct during the Boston Tea Party and draw conclusions." Such directions ought to predominate, while indeed they are the exception. Again, after most of the chapters, we find "Topics for Collateral Reading," accompanied by reference, volume and page, to some prominent work—the author usually varying with each set of topics. The topics are interesting and are such in the main as to throw light upon the great questions discussed in the text, and thus do not take the pupil away from the main currents of history. Some exception is found in the case of citations from Parkman. When a problem is to be solved, interest can hardly be the basis for the selection of material. The author says the "references are purposely made to a very few books, such as any school may have in its library without great expense." Now

just because public school libraries in small places have few books, references should have been made to a large number of books! These helps include one more feature, a bibliography of leading authorities for each period and also a list of the leading novels, poems, and songs relating to American history. Few texts for public school work on history give as many valuable aids aside from the body of the work.

The construction of the historical portion proper has been well executed, and the few errors of fact are not more than the ordinary work contains. The distribution of material is satisfactory in most respects. The chapters upon the Indians, and the discovery of America have been placed under the head of "Introduction." This is correct as far as it goes, but under this same head should also be placed the explorations of the various nations. There is no real American history till those ideas and institutions are planted out of which American life has grown. Therefore Spanish, French, and English explorations are a mere "introduction" to American history, and even then deserve a place only as far as they touch this life either to hinder or to help it. What argument drawn from the fundamental nature of history, or from American history, can justify giving space to the Mound Builders and the Pueblo Indians? The discussion of these topics might have given way to a chapter on the physical environment of American institutions. The remaining matter is rightly distributed in three great periods instead of in a larger number of artificial divisions. This conforms to the natural divisions in the subject itself. The only adverse criticism here is one that may be made against most texts: the use of a terminology in naming the periods and sub-periods which gives no clew to the nature of the movement characterizing the period. It may be allowable to designate a period by calling it "The Revolution," but would it not be more suggestive and helpful to call it the "Growth of Union between the Colonies and their Separation from England?" Here our very terminology calls attention to the two fundamental movements of the period. A change in terminology is especially needed in designating the phases of periods. Instead of "Causes and Beginnings of the Revolution," why not "The Struggle for the rights of Englishmen," and thus reveal the common content of all the great events between 1761 and 1775? In other words we need a text-book that sets the problem of history in the thoughts and feelings of the people instead of in external events. We have a right to expect this from John Fiske.

W. H. MACE

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY